

the airways. The traffic jams that are already difficult to navigate will grow by thousands, tens of thousands of cars. How would you like that? The airways between Boston, New York, and Washington already comprise the most congested airspace in the entire country. The air traffic control system cannot simply absorb dozens of additional flights during peak business travel times.

Mr. President, the July 4th holiday is almost upon us. As the celebrations approach, the warnings for potential terrorist attacks grow louder. We should heed those warnings and ensure that Amtrak stays open. Amtrak has a vital homeland security role. The railroad is a viable transportation alternative to highways and airways. To allow Amtrak to close its doors now, when the terrorist threats and the attack warnings come almost daily, would be irresponsible, wouldn't it? It seems to me it would be. To take away the safety net for the traveling public would be foolhardy, wouldn't it? Wouldn't it be? I would think so.

We also must consider the ramifications to the Nation's economy if Amtrak is allowed to file for bankruptcy. Immediately, more than 20,000 Amtrak employees would lose their jobs. That is 20,000 families without paychecks, 20,000 families without health care benefits. Thousands more jobs at commuter lines, suppliers, and vendors would be in jeopardy. In the blink of an eye, the Nation's economy would be dealt a devastating blow in States from coast to coast. With the economy in a precarious state as it is, with the markets fluctuating by the day, it makes no sense—none—to allow Amtrak to close.

With the support of the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS of Alaska, I have proposed, in our discussions with House conferees on the supplemental appropriations bill, that the supplemental appropriations bill, currently pending in conference, include at least \$205 million for Amtrak to keep trains running through the end of the fiscal year. With the looming crisis facing the Nation's passenger rail service, we should insist that this funding for Amtrak be part of the final version of the bill, hopefully to be considered by Congress this week.

The Senate included \$55 million for Amtrak emergency repairs in its version of the supplemental bill which passed on June 7 by an overwhelming margin of 71 to 22. The House did not include any funds for Amtrak in its bill. The conference report on the supplemental bill would build on the package already approved by the Senate and provide sufficient funding to keep Amtrak on track through the end of this fiscal year.

Last week, Amtrak's new president, David Gunn, testified before the Senate Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee. At that hearing, Mr. Gunn said:

The urgency of this is enormous. We are very near the point of no return.

Those are not ROBERT BYRD's words. They are the words of Mr. David Gunn, new president of Amtrak. Let me repeat them:

The urgency of this is enormous. We are very near the point of no return.

In the days since that hearing, there has been no news that I know about to change Mr. Gunn's assessment of the situation. Amtrak's board of directors has been involved in discussions with Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta and the Federal Railroad Administration. But the national administration, instead of stepping up to the plate and providing Amtrak with the funding that it needs, has pushed for a half-way approach that only delays the crisis.

I have spoken with Secretary Mineta. I have spoken with President Gunn. Following those conversations, it is clear that the best alternative is an emergency appropriation of \$205 million. That is cash on the barrel head. There is no time for creative accounting. There is no time for posturing. There is no time for so-called reforms. We can talk about reforms and improvements later, but we cannot reform a dead railroad. Amtrak needs help. It needs help now.

Last September, when the nation's airline industry was shut down, to whom did Americans turn for transportation? To Amtrak. Since then, Amtrak's ridership has continued to increase, with record numbers of Americans turning to passenger rail service. At a time when the Nation is turning to Amtrak, the Federal Government should not turn its back.

On September 21, after just a few hours of debate, Senators approved \$15 billion for the airline industry. Of those funds, \$10 billion was made available in loan guarantees and \$5 billion in cash for emergency grants. Few questions were asked. The airlines needed this infusion; the airlines got it. Congress acted; the administration acted. We should do the same now.

We did not blink when the airline industry faced a financial crisis. The administration did not urge grand reforms of the airline industry in order to qualify for these funds. Congress did not urge grand reforms of the airline industry in order to qualify for these funds. When asked for help, when the need was clear, Congress and the administration provided help to the airlines. We ought to show the same leadership for the Nation's rail passengers and employees.

The truth of the matter is that none of this has to happen. We can provide a short-term immediate solution for Amtrak to carry it through the fiscal year by enacting the proposal I have made, with the support of Senator STEVENS, in the supplemental appropriations conference, for \$205 million in the supplemental appropriations bill.

I have joined with more than 40 Senators to urge President Bush to support the \$205 million supplemental appro-

priation. As the letter states: The Nation's economy and the Nation's morale have suffered enough since September 11. Allowing the Nation's passenger rail service to shut down would idle more than 20,000 employees and throw the lives of tens of thousands of passengers into disarray. The administration and Congress must not allow this to happen.

Quite simply, Amtrak is vital. It is vital to those Americans who rely on Amtrak for their daily commute to and from work. It is vital to those Americans who use Amtrak for their vacation travel. It is vital to thousands of rail employees. It is vital to our Nation's homeland security. Congress should move ahead with an emergency appropriation for Amtrak and stave off the bankruptcy that would result in absolute chaos for the Nation's transportation network and would give certitude and assurance to Amtrak that the Federal Government, Congress, and the administration do not intend to let it happen to Amtrak; that the Federal Government, that Congress and the administration, stand ready to act, and act quickly. The administration and the congressional leadership should support the addition of \$205 million in the supplemental appropriations bill for Amtrak.

I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have in many ways a good Defense authorization bill. I am sorry we are debating again this year over national missile defense.

Last year, the same debate occurred. It was about the only major disagreement we had over the Defense authorization bill, but it is a very important issue. It is important to the people of the United States. It is important to the President and the Secretary of Defense who are charged with defending our homeland against attack. We have to debate it again this year. That is healthy. That is what this body is all about.

In 1999, it is important to recall, the Senate voted 97 to 3 to "deploy as soon as technologically feasible a national missile defense system." That represented the overwhelming consensus of opinion in this body. President Clinton signed that bill. President Clinton stated that he favored the deployment of a national missile defense system.

During the 2000 campaign, Vice President Gore said he was for it. President Bush made quite clear in his campaign for the Presidency that he considered the deployment of a national missile defense system a high priority for America.

We should not fail to note that Vice President Gore's candidate for Vice President, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, was

a cosponsor with Senator COCHRAN of the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 and a supporter of national missile defense. He quite clearly stated that position during the campaign for the Presidency.

It is a bipartisan issue. There is no doubt about it. President Bush had it somewhat higher on his priority than President Clinton, but everybody was on board about the issue in general.

When President Bush became President, he proposed last year for the 2002 budget a \$7.8 billion national missile defense budget.

President Clinton had proposed a \$5.3 billion national defense budget, so he was a little over \$2 billion above what President Clinton proposed. We voted on it in committee. On a party-line vote, the Democratic majority struck that increase—or a significant portion of it—from the bill. We took it to the floor last year and, after full debate, that money was restored.

Again this year the President asked for missile defense funds. It is not correct, however, to say he asked for an increase. He actually asked for less this year for national missile defense. He asked for, I believe, \$7.6 billion this year as opposed to \$7.8 billion last year, all of which was necessary to complete the research and development and testing that is necessary to bring this system online. Let me note, people say that is billions and billions of dollars. It is a lot of money, no doubt about it; but we have a \$376.2 billion defense budget. The \$7.6 billion needed to deploy and bring online a national missile defense system to protect us from missile attack is not too much, in my opinion, and is a rather small part of the overall defense budget.

So, again, we had in committee a 13 to 12 party-line vote on a motion that cut the President's request by over \$814.3 million this year. And the way those cuts were made—as Senator COCHRAN and others have noted, those cuts took parts of programs and undermined the brain trust or the capabilities of many of the systems—some of the testing capabilities that the people who have been a critic of the system say we ought to do. It undermined our ability to do that.

It is an unwise act, in my view. We need a continual, steady funding source that the Defense Department can count on so that they can develop, over a period of years, an effective national missile defense system. We would be very unwise if every year we cut a little bit and try to fight to put that back and go up and down in the budget. That costs more money in the long run and is not healthy. It was one of the President's top priorities when he took office. It is a top priority, I believe, of all Americans. I believe we should go forward with it.

Well, people say: Why do we need this budget? Why do we need a national missile defense? There are a lot of threats to America, but we don't believe we are threatened by intercontinental ballistic missiles—or words to that effect.

Several years ago, when President Clinton was President, he appointed a bipartisan commission, or one was selected and put together. The chairman turned out to be the now Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. That commission, after studying the intelligence situation, the threats facing America—Republicans and Democrats of both parties—unanimously agreed that we were facing an increased threat; that we would, indeed, be facing a ballistic missile threat to this country sooner than had been projected; and that we needed to prepare ourselves.

So I would like people to know how these things occur. We don't just, out of the blue, come up with ideas that we need to have a national missile defense. We deal with some of the best experts. We listen to their testimony in the Senate Armed Services Committee and, based on that testimony under oath, recognizing that what witnesses say has great import, they help us decide how to spend our resources.

Admiral Wilson, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, told us this recently, on March 19 of this year, about Iran: Iran continues “the development and acquisition of longer range missiles and weapons of mass destruction to deter the United States and to intimidate Iran's neighbors.” He added about Iran, “It is buying and developing longer range missiles.”

He notes that Iran already has chemical weapons and is “pursuing biological and nuclear capabilities,” both of which can be placed inside an intercontinental ballistic missile. He concludes on Iran that Iran will “likely acquire a full range of weapons of mass destruction capability, field substantial numbers of ballistic and cruise missiles, including perhaps an ICBM, that will be capable of hitting the United States.”

Admiral Wilson on Iraq: “Baghdad continues to work on short-range—150 kilometer—missiles and can use this expertise for future long-range missile development.” He adds, “Iraq may also have begun to reconstitute chemical and biological weapons programs,” as we have heard so much concern expressed about, all of which can be delivered by missile. Wilson concludes that “it is possible that Iraq can develop and test an ICBM capable of reaching the United States by 2015.”

Admiral Wilson on North Korea: “Korea continues to place heavy emphasis on the improvement of its military capability and North Korea continues its robust efforts to develop more capable ballistic missiles.”

We know North Korea has been doing that for some time and testing those missiles. Admiral Wilson said this specifically as to North Korea: It is “developing an ICBM capability with its Taepo Dong 2 missile, judged capable of delivering a several hundred kilogram payload to Alaska and Hawaii, and a lighter payload to the western half of the United States.” They have that capability in North Korea now.

The President of the United States has to deal with these issues. He has to

consider what might happen as he deals with these countries.

Admiral Wilson, further on North Korea, added this: “It probably has the capability to field”—that means put into place right now—“an ICBM within the next couple of years.” That is a frightening thought. “North Korea continues,” he added, “to proliferate”—that is to sell or distribute—“weapons of mass destruction, and especially weapons technology.”

CIA Director George Tenet, in March of this year before the Armed Services Committee, said this about the Chinese military buildup:

Earlier this month, Beijing announced a 17.6 increase in defense spending, replicating last year's increase of 17.7 percent. If this trend continues, China could double its announced defense spending between 2000 and 2005.

Tenet added further on China:

China continues to make progress toward fielding its first generation of road-mobile strategic missiles, the DF-31, a longer range version, capable of reaching targets in the United States, which will become operational later this decade.

In the CIA's unclassified report of January 10 of this year, entitled “Foreign Missile Development,” they wrote this:

China has about 20 liquid propellant missiles, silo based, that could reach targets in the United States.

The report also said China continues “a long-running modernizational program and expects within 15 years to have 75 to 100 ICBM's deployed primarily against the United States.”

Admiral Wilson, testifying about the China situation, noted:

One of Beijing's top military priorities is to strengthen and modernize its small daily strategic nuclear deterrent force.

He continues:

The number, reliability, survivability, and accuracy of Chinese strategic missiles, capable of hitting the United States, will increase during the next 10 years.

There are about 15 to 16 countries now that have these kinds of missiles. I shared those from some recent testimonies we have had before our committee. This is not a myth. We are not talking about an abstract idea. We are talking about a different world. In the previous world, the Soviet Union had missiles, we had missiles, and we entered into a treaty to bar the deployment of a national missile defense system. We agreed to that, and it worked for some time.

Unfortunately—or fortunately in some ways—the country we had a treaty with, the Soviet Union, no longer exists, but Russia exists. The treaty was with the Soviet Union. During that same period of time, all these other countries were developing the capabilities to threaten us. So we now had a treaty with a country that used to be our enemy, and it no longer is, that was barring us from deploying and producing a defensive system for our country. That did not make sense, and the

President had the gumption, the courage, and the wisdom to say we did not need to be in this treaty any longer, that it did not serve our interests. He worked with the Russians, and we had Members of this body about to have a conniption fit that if we violated or took steps to get out of this treaty, as the treaty gave us the right to do, somehow this would cause another cold war, an arms race with Russia, and do all kinds of damage to our relationship.

President Bush worked on this, and the Russians knew this was not critical to their defense. We knew it was not critical to the Russian defense. What was important about it was it was complicating our ability to develop a missile system that made sense. Under that treaty, we were trying to build a system that could have only one location for the missiles. It has to cover the entire United States from that one system. The treaty explicitly prohibited mobile systems such as ship-based; it kept us from developing a system that would take out missiles in the launch phase; it would have kept us from doing space-based defense systems, all of which were prohibited by the treaty.

President Bush was serious about national missile defense, and he took the steps to eliminate that. Indeed, Phil Coyle, who has been a big critic of the national missile defense system, in a recent quote in the newspaper said, with grudging admiration—I think he said, well, they are serious about it. And that is correct. This President is serious about producing a layered defense system for America.

We are doing it for the \$7.6 billion in this year's budget. If we do this over a period of years, we are going to be able to successfully implement a system that can protect us from limited missile attack. It cannot protect us from the kind of attack the Russians could have launched, but it can protect us against limited attack, accidental attack, or rogue nation attack. We have that capability, and we should do it. We do not need President Bush sitting down eyeball to eyeball with Saddam Hussein, knowing Saddam Hussein can push a button and a nuclear weapon or a chemical or biological weapon that he has can hit New York City or some other American city. We do not need him in that position. He does not need to be there, and we can avoid that.

Great nations do not allow themselves to be in a situation where the ability to act in their national interest will be compromised by these kinds of threats by nations that have not shown themselves to have a commitment to civilized behavior. That is simply where we are.

So I believe this country needs to deploy this national missile defense system. I am sorry there are some who do not agree, and they have been consistent in opposing it in every way possible. I have to respect that, but we voted 97 to 3 to deploy it. Both Presidential candidates said they wanted it.

We funded it last year at \$7.8 billion, after a full floor debate, and we did not do it thinking that was going to be the only year we funded national missile defense. When we voted last year to fund national missile defense, we contemplated and considered that we would be funding it on a steady basis to complete a program as the President envisioned. We have to start now. They say these missiles are not able to reach us today. Well, it takes a number of years to develop, get the bugs out, and study this system so we have the best system.

The President has been tough about this. He cancelled the Navy theater-wide program that many people believed in, but it was behind schedule, over budget, and not performing, so he cancelled it. He said that is not getting us to where we need to go. He has shown he is willing to make tough calls, but the ultimate goal is to reach a situation in which we can deploy a system by the time our enemies have the capability of reaching us.

This Senate is at its best when we talk about important issues. I believe in many ways this one has been settled. The American people voted for two candidates who favored it in the last election. The President has pushed it forward. We funded it last year at the President's request; we should not come in now to take a big whack out of it and target programs that really are pretty key. These cuts have the unfortunate impact of undermining some of the work that would be done.

For example, it eliminates 10 THAAD missiles. Those are the theater missiles. When we have troops out on the battlefield in the theater of operations, if Saddam Hussein has a missile that will go 150 kilometers, then he can hit them if he cannot hit the United States. So we cannot deploy our people and leave them vulnerable to being annihilated by an enemy attack if we have the capability to defend it, and we do. The THAAD is going to be a highly successful program, but this bill, as it was voted out of committee over my objection, would eliminate 10 THAAD missiles that would be used for future testing and it would put the success of the program in jeopardy by not allowing it to fly through failures.

In other words, these programs have to be tested, robust tested. Some of the critics are probably correct in saying we did not have enough testing in the system. The President's budget will enhance testing.

The bill, as proposed on the floor today, delays or eliminates planning for promising boost phase programs. In other words, one of the best ways to knock down an incoming missile is when it is coming off the ground in the foreign country. So if it falls back, it falls back on their country. If it is missed, there still may be an ABM system in the United States that can knock it down later. If those systems could be knocked down through absolute communications capabilities in

the region, sea-based capabilities, that would be ideal. All of that was prohibited in the treaty. That is one of the reasons the President got rid of it.

This bill, as it is today, would eliminate planning for promising boost phase programs. It eliminates sea- and space-based kinetic kill experiments in the field. It imposes serious risk to the airborne laser program by eliminating funding for a second aircraft testing program. It will not allow the airborne laser program to fly through failure, to figure out what will really work and make it successful. It imposes numerous tests and evaluation restrictions and duplicative oversight requirements on the Missile Defense Agency.

We have been very fortunate that General Kadish is head of this program. He is a man of ability, integrity, and steadfastness. He has nurtured it through good and ill. He has seen it hit successfully time and again in recent months, and he is leading it on through quite a successful program. It has been well managed. He is very concerned about these cuts. It will complicate his strategic vision of how to produce and deploy this system as we have told him we want him to do.

It is important to know that we have a man in charge who is capable and knows how to get the job done, and he is very troubled that we are cutting back in this fashion.

In sum, I note these cuts will expose the United States to unnecessary risks if we enact them. I do not believe they will be enacted. I believe we will vote to restore the cuts. I know the bill passed in the House of Representatives has this funding in it, and they will insist on it. I am not sure the President will accept the bill that has these large cuts in our national missile defense.

It is time to move ahead. I believe we can deploy a system that is layered in nature, that will have a shot at knocking down an attacking missile in a boost phase, that can hit in midcourse and defend again with a layer system on the land of the United States. Then we will not be in the bizarre situation of several years ago when we were trying to maneuver our national missile defense system to fit the ABM Treaty, to allow just one site to produce, that would limit testing and development in a lot of different areas.

We are on the right track. Let's stay the course. Let's not back up now. Let's not manipulate this program and endanger it. This is a small part, \$800 million out of a \$386 billion budget. Let's not gimmick around with it. Let's get on with it. Let's stay committed. We will save money in the long run and have a system that will protect the people of the United States from rogue attack, from nations that are desperately attempting to have an ICBM system such as Korea and Iraq.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN DART, JR.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Saturday was a sad day for America and for all who have fought so hard for the rights of people with disabilities in our society. On Saturday, our Nation lost one of its great heroes: My good friend, Justin Dart, Jr.

Justin Dart was the godfather of the disability rights movement. For 30 years he fought to end prejudice against people with disabilities, to strengthen the disabilities right movement, to protect the rights of people with disabilities. Millions of Americans with disabilities never knew his name but they owe him so much.

Justin was born August 28, 1930. His grandfather was the founder of the Walgreen Drug store chain. His father was also a very successful businessman. Justin was the son of privilege and wealth, but he became the brother of the forgotten and the downtrodden, those whom society left on the roadside of life. From the time that polio left him a wheelchair user in 1948, to this past Saturday when he passed away, Justin lived a life dedicated to social justice for people with disabilities and for all people regardless of race or gender or sexual orientation. He is, of course, best known as the godfather of the disabilities rights movement and the father of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Justin was both a close personal friend of mine and a mentor for me on disability policy. When I first came to the Senate—after having worked in the House on a couple of disability issues because I had a brother who was disabled; I came to the Senate in 1985—at that time there was a big movement on to pass a Civil Rights Act for Americans with disabilities. I got caught up in that.

I wondered, is it possible we could ever pass a civil rights bill for people with disabilities? Through a set of circumstances and fate, I became the chairman of the Disability Policy Subcommittee and then became the lead sponsor of the Americans With Disabilities Act. It was under my sponsorship on that committee, and with the guiding hand of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, who was the chairman of the full committee, that we were able to get the bill through both the House and the Senate, signed into law July 26, 1990, by President George Bush.

When I first got here and became involved with the disability rights movement and with the jelling, the pulling together of all these people to get the

Americans With Disabilities Act passed, it did not take me long to realize it was Justin Dart who was pulling the pieces together. For so many years, the disability community has been segregated and segmented—the deaf community, the blind community, those who used wheelchairs, those with mental disabilities, those who had illnesses and diseases. Various forms of disability had their own segments but no one brought them together under an umbrella. It was the power and the force, the magnetism of Justin Dart that brought it together, that made it into a movement whereby we could actually get the Americans With Disabilities Act passed.

It was fitting that on July 26, 1990, we all gathered on the White House lawn for the biggest gathering for a bill signing on the White House lawn in the history of this country. It was a gorgeous, sunny day. We were all there. Senator Dole had been a great companion in helping get the bill passed on the Senate side; so many people from the House side, including Tony Coelho, STENY HOYER, but there on the platform was President Bush and Justin Dart. It was right that he was there on that platform.

When President Bush signed the Americans With Disabilities Act, he gave the first pen to Justin Dart. He truly was the one who brought us together and gave the inspiration and guidance to get this wonderful, magnificent bill through.

The rest, as they say, is history. Go anywhere in America today and you will see people with disabilities in workplaces, in schools, traveling with their families to restaurants, going to theaters, going to sports arenas. All new buildings have wide doorways, ramps everywhere. No building being built today is not accessible—because of the Americans With Disabilities Act, because of Justin Dart.

What a tremendous legacy. Justin was a recipient of five Presidential appointments, numerous honors, including the Hubert Humphrey Award of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. In 1998, Justin Dart received a Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian award. Before he passed away on Saturday, Justin left a letter. I don't know exactly when it was written. But I think Justin knew that his time on Earth was not going to be much longer. He had a series of setbacks. He lost his leg just about 3 years ago. We thought we lost him then, but, man, he came back strong and continued to lead. He wrote this letter, which is just so profound.

I ask unanimous consent to have this last letter from Justin Dart printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIN DART, JR.
Washington, DC.

I am with you. I love you. Lead on.

DEARLY BELOVED: Listen to the heart of this old soldier. As with all of us the time

comes when body and mind are battered and weary. But I do not go quietly into the night. I do not give up struggling to be a responsible contributor to the sacred continuum of human life. I do not give up struggling to overcome my weakness, to conform my life—and that part of my life called death—to the great values of the human dream.

Death is not a tragedy. It is not an evil from which we must escape. Death is as natural as birth. Like childbirth death is often a time of fear and pain, but also of profound beauty, of celebration of the mystery and majesty which is life pushing its horizons toward oneness with the truth of mother universe. The days of dying carry a special responsibility. There is a great potential to communicate values in a uniquely powerful way—the person who dies demonstrating for civil rights.

Let my final actions thunder of love solidarity, protest—of empowerment.

I adamantly protest the richest culture in the history of the world, a culture which has the obvious potential to create a golden age of science and democracy dedicated to maximizing the quality of life of every person, but which still squanders the majority of its human and physical capital on modern versions of primitive symbols of power and prestige.

I adamantly protest the richest culture in the history of the world which still incarcerates millions of humans with and without disabilities in barbaric institutions, backrooms and worse, windowless cells of oppressive perceptions, for the lack of the most elementary empowerment supports.

I call for solidarity among all who love justice all who love life, to create a revolution that will empower every single human being to govern his or her life, to govern the society and to be fully productive of life quality for self and for all.

I do so love all the patriots of this and every nation who have fought and sacrificed to bring us to the threshold of this beautiful human dream. I do so love America the beautiful and our wild, creative beautiful people. I do so love you, my beautiful colleagues in the disability and civil rights movement.

My relationship with Yoshiko Dart includes, but also transcends, love as the word is normally defined. She is my wife, my partner, my mentor, my leader and my inspiration to believe that the human dream can live. She is the greatest human being I have ever known.

Yoshiko, beloved colleagues, I am the luckiest man in the world to have been associated with you. Thanks to you, I die free. Thanks to you, I die in the joy of struggle. Thanks to you, I die in the beautiful belief that the revolution of empowerment will go on. I love you so much. I'm with you always. Lead on! Lead on!

JUSTIN DART

Mr. HARKIN. I will not read the whole thing but I feel constrained to read parts. He said:

I am with you. I love you. Lead on.

DEARLY BELOVED: Listen to the heart of this old soldier. As with all of us the time comes when body and mind are battered and weary. But I do not go quietly into the night. I do not give up struggling to be a responsible contributor to the sacred continuum of human life. I do not give up struggling to overcome my weakness, to conform my life—and that part of my life called death—to the great values of the human dream.

Death is not a tragedy. It is not an evil from which we must escape. Death is as natural as birth. Like childbirth, death is often